

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/724,173	HAMON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Edward M. Johnson	1754	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Edward M. Johnson.

(3) Jonathan Burns.

(2) Jeff Vockrodt.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 November 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ward '575; Farnos '147; Tretjak US 5,582,810.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant presented Tretjak '810, the English language version of EP 0,625,369, which is compared to the catalyst of the invention in the instant specification. Applicant asserted that this comparison shows that the selection of ferrierite is superior to the mordenite of the prior art. Applicant also asserted that it would not have been obvious to select the claimed combination of ferrierite and potassium from the broad teachings of the prior art. Applicant also presented a declaration explaining the detailed comparisons of the instant specification.